



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,302	11/14/2003	Andrew H. Barr	200308580-1	2112
22879 7590 04/10/2007 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER MCCARTHY, CHRISTOPHER S	
			ART UNIT 2113	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			04/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/714,302

Applicant(s)

BARR ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher S. McCarthy

Art Unit

2113

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 15-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11-14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-5, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jenkins et al. U.S. Patent 6,002,868.

As per claim 1, Jenkins teaches a computer system comprising a processor; a first bus coupled to the processor; a memory; and a core electronics complex including: a memory controller coupled to the first bus and the memory (column 3, lines 24-46); a first input/output (I/O) controller coupled to the first bus and configured to couple to a first set of one or more I/O devices using a first connection (column 4, lines 3-14, figure 1, wherein the line from items 130 to 128 are deemed a first connection); and a test module (column 4, lines 32-34) coupled to the first I/O controller using a second connection that is separate from the first connection (figure 1, wherein, the test module is coupled to the I/O controller by means of bridge and bus); wherein the test module is configured to cause tests to be performed on the memory using the first bus (column 4, lines 32-34; column 7, line 46 – column 8, line 25, wherein, multiple memories are tested).

As per claim 2, Jenkins teaches the computer system of claim 1 further comprising: an operating system; wherein the processor is configured to cause the operating system to be booted, and wherein the test module is configured to cause the tests to be performed on the memory using the first bus subsequent to the operating system being booted (column 4, lines 24-34).

As per claim 3, Jenkins teaches the computer system of claim 1 further comprising: an operating system; wherein the processor is configured to cause the operating system to be executed, and wherein the test module is configured to cause the tests to be performed on the memory using the first bus during execution of the operating system (column 4, lines 24-34).

As per claim 4, Jenkins teaches the computer system of claim 1 wherein the first bus comprises a system bus (column 3, lines 53-67).

As per claim 5, Jenkins teaches the computer system of claim 1 further comprising: a second bus (column 3, lines 53-67, figure 1, item 128) a second set of one or more I/O devices coupled to the second bus (column 4, lines 3-6, figure 1, items 142,144); wherein the core electronics complex includes a second I/O controller coupled to the first bus and the second bus (column 4, lines 3-6, figure 1, item 136).

As per claim 8, Jenkins teaches the computer system of claim 1 further comprising: a bus bridge coupled to the first bus and the first I/O controller (column 3, lines 53-67; figure 1, item 122).

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6-7, 9-10, 15-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jenkins in view of Shaffer et al. U.S. Patent 5,619,513.

As per claim 6, Jenkins teaches the computer system of claim 1 wherein the test module is configured to cause tests to be performed on the memory using the first bus to the first I/O controller (column 4, lines 24-34). However, Jenkins does not explicitly teach providing read and write transactions for testing. Shaffer does teach providing read and write transactions for testing (column 1, lines 44-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins because Shaffer teaches the testing of memory modules in a system and reporting the errors therein (column 3, lines 19-31); an explicit desire of Jenkins (column 7, line 46 – column 8, line 39).

As per claim 7, Jenkins in view of Shaffer teaches the computer system of claim 6. Shaffer teaches wherein the read and write transactions comprise direct memory access (DMA) transactions (column 2, lines 50-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins because Shaffer teaches the testing of memory modules in a system and reporting the errors therein (column 3, lines 19-31); an explicit desire of Jenkins (column 7, line 46 – column 8, line 39).

As per claim 9, Jenkins teaches a method performed by a computer system that includes a memory comprising: selecting a portion of the memory for testing during operation of the computer system; generating a test transaction in a test module coupled to an input/output (I/O) controller using a first connection that is separate from a second connection that is configured to couple the I/O controller to one or more I/O devices; the test module and the I/O controller included in a chipset coupled to the memory; and providing the test transaction to the portion (see rejection 1 inclusive of the following: column 4, lines 3-14, figure 1, wherein the line from items 130 to 128 are deemed a first connection ;column 3, lines 24-46; column 4, lines 32-34; column 7, line 46 – column 8, line 25, wherein, multiple memories are tested). Jenkins does not explicitly teach using direct memory access (DMA). Shaffer does teach using direct memory access (DMA) (column 2, lines 50-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins because Shaffer teaches the testing of memory modules in a system and reporting the errors therein (column 3, lines 19-31); an explicit desire of Jenkins (column 7, line 46 – column 8, line 39).

2

As per claim 10, Jenkins teaches the method of claim 9 further comprising: detecting an error that occurs in response to the test transaction; and performing a remedial action in response to detecting the error (column 8, lines 26-39).

As per claim 15, Jenkins teaches a computer system comprising: a processor; a bus coupled to the processor; a memory; a core electronics complex including: a system controller coupled to the bus and the memory; an input/output (I/O) controller coupled to the system controller and configured to couple to a set of one or more I/O devices using a first connection; and a test module coupled to the I/O controller using a second connection that is separate from the first connection; wherein the test module is configured to cause tests to be performed on the memory (see rejection 1 inclusive of the following: column 4, lines 3-14, figure 1, wherein the line from items 130 to 128 are deemed a first connection ;column 3, lines 24-46; column 4, lines 32-34; column 7, line 46 – column 8, line25, wherein, multiple memories are tested). Jenkins does not explicitly teach using direct memory access (DMA). Shaffer does teach using direct memory access (DMA) (column 2, lines 50-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins because Shaffer teaches the testing of memory modules in a system and reporting the errors therein (column 3, lines 19-31); an explicit desire of Jenkins (column 7, line 46 – column 8, line 39).

As per claim 16, Jenkins in view of Shaffer teaches the computer system of claim 15. Jenkins teaches it further comprising: an operating system; wherein the processor is configured

Art Unit: 2113

to cause the operating system to be booted, and wherein the test module is configured to cause the tests to be performed on the memory subsequent to the operating system being booted (column 3, lines 24-39; column 4, 32-34). Jenkins does not explicitly teach using DMA. Shaffer does teach using DMA (column 2, lines 50-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins because Shaffer teaches the testing of memory modules in a system and reporting the errors therein (column 3, lines 19-31); an explicit desire of Jenkins (column 7, line 46 – column 8, line 39).

As per claim 17, Jenkins in view of Shaffer the computer system of claim 15 further comprising: an operating system; wherein the processor is configured to cause the operating system to be executed, and wherein the test module is configured to cause the tests to be performed on the memory during execution of the operating system (column 3, lines 24-39; column 4, 32-34). Jenkins does not explicitly teach using DMA. Shaffer does teach using DMA (column 2, lines 50-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins because Shaffer teaches the testing of memory modules in a system and reporting the errors therein (column 3, lines 19-31); an explicit desire of Jenkins (column 7, line 46 – column 8, line 39).

Art Unit: 2113

As per claim 18, Jenkins teaches the computer system of claim 15 wherein the bus comprises a system bus (column 3, lines 53-67).

As per claim 19, Jenkins in view of Shaffer teaches the computer system of claim 15, wherein the test module is configured to cause tests to be performed on the memory by providing transactions to the I/O controller (column 4, lines 24-34). However, Jenkins does not explicitly teach using DMA by providing read and write transactions for testing. Shaffer does teach using DMA providing read and write transactions for testing (column 1, lines 44-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins because Shaffer teaches the testing of memory modules in a system and reporting the errors therein (column 3, lines 19-31); an explicit desire of Jenkins (column 7, line 46 – column 8, line 39).

As per claim 20, Jenkins in view of Shaffer teaches the computer system of claim 19, Shaffer teaches wherein the read and write transactions comprise direct memory access (DMA) transactions (column 2, lines 50-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the R/W and DMA testing process of Shaffer in the general testing process of Jenkins because Shaffer teaches the testing of memory modules in a system and reporting the errors therein (column 3, lines 19-31); an explicit desire of Jenkins (column 7, line 46 – column 8, line 39).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 11-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: As per claims 11 and 14, Jenkins nor Shaffer teach the sequential transactions of transmission as claimed.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, see pages 7-9, filed 2/26/07, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-20 under Adamane in view of Microsoft have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Jenkins and Shaffer.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: See attached PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher S. McCarthy whose telephone number is (571)272-3651. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (571)272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Christopher S. McCarthy
Examiner
Art Unit 2113

Application/Control Number: 10/714,302
Art Unit: 2113

Page 11